

C2-277

**From:** Matt  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 2:11 PM  
**Subject:** Please read

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.
- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.
- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.
- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming.

Thanks for your time, Matthew Pilon

02-277

**From:** john taylor  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Fri, May 16, 2003 9:55 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Please uphold "real access"

The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner,

Please do not make rule changes that would favor huge media giants in their quest to increase market share. For all practical purposes, I believe their ultimate goal is to gain complete ownership and control of the media. Whether the goal is largely financial or for greater control over public opinion it matters little as the result is the same. The large media conglomerates are able to choose what is appropriate broadcast material for the masses. It is a greatly restricted viewpoint. I plead your support to uphold existing "Broadcast Ownership Rules." Having a free media requires that people have a real option to choose alternative programming and viewpoints. This will not be the case if the "Big Boys" are allowed to continue to seize greater and greater control over the airwaves and forever gain increasing market share. Please consider the truth of what I wrote. Thank you!

Respectfully Yours,  
John Taylor - WI

**From:** Gerald Cazel  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Fri, May 16, 2003 10:25 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Action

The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner

Dear Sir:

On June 2nd, you will take the final vote on whether or not to change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules,"

and allow giant media conglomerates to grab an even bigger share of television and radio stations across our nation.

If these rule changes are adopted, it could give a tiny handful of media executives the unchallenged power to keep any

viewpoints off the T.V. and radio airwaves in thousands of communities across our nation -- small towns and big

cities alike. The big media conglomerates have proved in the past that they WILL use their power to keep opposing viewpoints on any issue off the air and these proposed rule changes would extend that power even further.

If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States

could be snuffed out by huge media corporations. Whole communities and even whole states and regions

could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

I believe it is imperative that the rules not be changed in order to retain the voice of the many as opposed to

the voice of a select few.

Thank you,  
Gerald Cazel

Springfield, IL (A capital city where a major network (CBS) cannot be received without a cable subscription.)

If you find yourself in a hole, the first thing to do is stop diggin'.

~~Will Rogers

**From:** James Saulsbury  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 17, 2003 3:22 AM  
**Subject:** request

Please do not adopt "broadcast ownership rules" as proposed. Thank you.

A kind smile will do a lot to make life's pressure less of a burden

**From:** Steve McPhail  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 17, 2003 8:06 AM  
**Subject:** Fw:

----- Original Message -----

From: Steve McPhail  
To: mpowell@fcc.gov  
Sent: Saturday, May 17, 2003 8:06 AM

As a life member of the NRA, I urge you to vote not to change the rules, which would keep liberal media giants from gaining more control of the American media, in effect keeping them from promoting their anti-gun, and other liberal rhetoric and falsehoods.

Thanks

Steve McPhail, NRA

**From:** williamh5  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, May 17, 2003 12:41 PM  
**Subject:** message

dear mike . this message is in ref. to giving only a few people in this country the power and control of all the media..mike this has not worked in other countries like russia etc. to give this much power to just a few is like giving them a license to hold all the people of the usa prisoners..... please do not let this happen.

**From:** Lowell Jarrett  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 1:48 PM  
**Subject:** Fw:

----- Original Message -----

From: Lowell Jarrett  
To: mpowell@fcc.gov  
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2003 7:28 AM

No to the change in the "Broadcast Ownership Rules".

Lowell Jarrett  
Hendersonville, NC

**CC:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Bob Rivers  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** More stations, more public influence - less public service, less diversification

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, the Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, the Honorable Michael J. Copps, the Honorable Kevin J. Martin, and the Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein,

Please do not allow the media to be controlled by a few large companies. As a voter, sportsman, shotgun owner and hunting dog owner, I am very sensitive to the anti-hunter and anti-gun owner media. Please support diversification in the media, not monopolistic control.

Thank you,  
Bob Rivers  
9720 Manassas Forge Drive  
Manassas, VA 20111  
(703) 367-0425



**From:** Hunters  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 5:06 PM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

I am intensely opposed to any action that would allow increased consolidation of the ownership of media. I am in favor of steps to force more diversity in ownership and control of media.

The airways are first of all public. The public's first need is for the freest possible "press", which now extends to the modern technological versions of the Constitution's "press". Freedom of the Press is the most important of democratic freedoms. The economic growth of commercial enterprise falls far behind in importance.

Do not fold under pressure from the commercial interests, or from the conservative politicians that are seeking to extend their power and control. The future of freedom in America is in your hands.

Thank you,  
Patrick Hunter  
Carbondale, CO

**From:** Michael Mahon  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 6:46 PM  
**Subject:** Upcoming Vote

To All Members; F.C.C.

Now is not the time to be consolidating power in the few for control of our media. We need strong leaders to prevent corporate control - not enhance it if democracy is to survive.

Please, for the sake of all our children and theirs, when it comes time to vote, consider that.

Michael J Mahon  
209 Armentiers Rd  
Forestville, Ca. 95436

**From:** Watkins  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 6:47 PM  
**Subject:** This is WRONG

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.
- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.
- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.
- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming.

The information transmitted hereby, including attachments, is intended only for the recipient(s) indicated and might contain confidential or privileged information. If you receive this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the communication and attachments from your computers and systems. Although this communication is believed to be free of virus, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free and the recipient accepts all responsibility for any loss or damage arising in the event a virus exists.

has notified the sender that this message has been received.

**From:** Jason & Kandi Quick  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 8:13 PM  
**Subject:** I agree with the NRA

I would like to agree with the NRA on these points...Please protect my rights!

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.
- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.
- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.
- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming

Thanks for your Time

Jason Quick and Family

**From:** Glenn and Cheryl Jakubowski  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 8:24 PM  
**Subject:** June 2nd

Please vote against FCC rule changes on June 2nd! All sides need to be heard in all controversial cases! One sided bias should not, and cannot be allowed in ANY situation! The 5th amendment is supposed to guarantee freedom of speech, from all sides! Please vote to uphold our constitutional rights!! Guns don't kill people, people kill people!!!

Glenn & Cheryl Jakubowski

**From:** William Babb  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 8:53 PM  
**Subject:** Concerns

If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, it will have the effect of further crippling the freedom of speech that is our right under the U.S. Constitution. Any move, regardless of what it's called, that relaxes the rules of corporate takeovers opens the door to power-hungry corporate executives imposing their views on the American people even more than they already do. Just as an adversarial form of government maintains somewhat balanced distribution of political power, so the existence of independent broadcasters helps to present multiple views of issues to the people for them to make their own decisions.

I urge you to think first of the integrity of the information flow to the people and ignore corporate pressures as you decide these issues.

William Babb  
Concerned citizen  
siteworker@earthlink.net

**From:** Jay J. Arnold  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, becerra@mail.house.gov, edhearn@aol.com, info@alternet.org, editorial@progressive.org, thedish@surfglobal.net, mdnews@ndweb.com  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 9:54 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: LARadio - Sounds Familiar For a Reason

To whom it may concern,  
This Washington Post article should interest you. This story below only adds to why we should NOT deregulate broadcasting any further, and why we should perhaps start RE-regulating the broadcast industry.

Remember: "The lack of complaint is hardly an endorsement."

Thank you for your time.  
--J Arnold  
(retired from radio after 21 years, not by choice)

\*\*\*\*\*

--- D. Paulson <e-mail> wrote:  
**From:** Don Barrett  
**Reply-To:** Don Barrett  
**To:** <Undisclosed-Recipient:>  
**Subject:** LARadio - Sounds Familiar For a Reason  
**Date:** Sun, 18 May 2003 04:32:50 -0700

Sounds Familiar For a Reason

By Marc Fisher, Washington Post, 5.17

Technology begets wonders, such as radio talk show host Brian Wilson, who, thanks to satellites and the Internet, sits on his farm north of Baltimore and talks California politics with listeners on San Francisco's KSFO. Wilson wakes each day, fires up his Web browser and reads the morning San Francisco Chronicle online for the latest news from clear across the country. He's so good that his listeners could be forgiven for thinking that he's in the City by the Bay rather than in a bedroom in Maryland. This is what passes for local radio these days.

Satellites and digital recording also make it possible for oldies deejay Tom Kelly to finish up his afternoon air shift on WBIG in Rockville, then sit down in front of a microphone and record his next job, as JJ Jackson, the overnight oldies jock on KQQL in Minneapolis. And no one's the wiser -- except, of course, Clear Channel Communications Inc., which owns both stations. You do have to give Clear Channel a hand for this wink and nudge on the KQQL Website: "Actually, JJ is perhaps the most 'there' overnight presence in Twin Cities FM radio."

Deregulation in the media industries begets wonders, too, producing not only deejays with multiple personalities, but multiple stations with single corporate identities. Ever since Congress eased limits on media ownership in 1996, companies such as Clear Channel and Viacom Inc. have gobbled up hundreds of radio stations, threatening diversity. In many cities, a single company controls a majority of radio advertising revenue and makes most of the programming decisions. Since 1996, Clear Channel alone went from 40 stations to more than 1,200; add the company's prominence in the concert promotion and outdoor advertising businesses and you have unprecedented influence on the nation's popular music.

The combination of technological change and freedom from government regulation has not liberated owners to do more with less; rather, companies have lunged at the chance to do far less and rake in much more.

Come June 2, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is expected to approve new rules that would allow even more consolidation in the media: TV networks would be permitted to buy more stations than they are now, a media company would be allowed to own as many as three TV stations in one city, and restrictions on cross-ownership between newspapers and broadcast stations would be lifted.

After an expected binge of station and network sales, companies with the deepest pockets could assert control over a region's major radio stations, cable TV system, Internet service providers, a couple of TV stations and perhaps the local paper, too. Synergy, that much-lampooned dream of 1990s media boosters, could finally happen in a big way, with one company providing news and entertainment via all media from a single newsroom. The result would hardly be a boon to newsgathering; rather, it would result in diminished public service.

FCC Chairman Michael Powell and other champions of further deregulation have taken the infinite capacity of the Internet as rationale for scrapping much of the remaining regulation of the airwaves. Does the FCC need to worry about media diversity when technology now lets any Jane Q. Citizen get on the Web and blog to her heart's content?

In a word, yes. The 1990s-boom-era rhetoric has come up empty, and Powell knows it. Despite the infinite promise of the Internet, cable TV, digital and satellite radio and whatever other marvels may lie ahead, the reality of corporate consolidation has been a serious diminution in the variety of opinions, news reports, musical choices and cultural offerings in both the commercial and public media.

Greater concentration of ownership in TV would reinforce a remarkable oligopoly in which five companies -- Viacom/CBS, Disney/ABC, NBC, AOL Time Warner and News Corp./Fox -- boast 75 percent of primetime TV viewers.

The test case for consolidation has been radio. Ever since the 1996 easing of restrictions on ownership, big media companies have faced off against musicians, activists and some of the few remaining mom and pop station owners. The media companies say the airwaves offer a more bountiful selection of artistic riches than ever before and that they have brought big-city talent to backwater communities, replacing farm reports, swap shops and amateurish deejays.

But listeners hear the nation's broadcasters pressing the culture to its lowest common denominator in a cynical money grab. Rush Limbaugh, Howard Stern and Tom Joyner are piped into your hometown by satellite.

The big companies do offer variety -- of a sort. In Washington, Clear Channel introduced a new format, Jam'n Oldies, featuring disco and danceable R&B of the 1970s; the station flopped, but executives say that sort of innovation wouldn't have happened unless one firm had eight outlets in one city to experiment with.

But in the past few years, Washington listeners have lost far more music choices than they have gained, on both commercial and public radio: standards (WGAY, the only station in the market that aimed at older listeners, tried a series of failed formats); jazz (WDCU was sold to C-SPAN, which uses the frequency as a prototype of a satellite-delivered national audio service); bluegrass (WAMU dropped much of its local music programming to serve up more news and talk produced for a national audience); and classical (WETA dropped some daily music offerings to simulcast news programs already heard on WAMU).

In city after city, Clear Channel points to formats it has added -- hip-hop here, alternative rock there. But critics contend that even when the big companies add program formats, the music they play is the same old stuff. A study by the Future of Music Coalition, a Washington-based artists group, found that different formats feature almost identical playlists, sharing as much as 76 percent of the songs they play.



More important, the radio chain -- saddled with \$8 billion in debt from its '90s acquisition spree -- has cut costs and increased ad rates to squeeze operating profits from its stations. The chain has replaced local deejays and news announcers with jocks who sit in Phoenix or Denver and record shows for stations thousands of miles away, tossing in a few local references for verisimilitude ("Hey, tough day on I-10! How about those Bucs!"). News operations have been eliminated or outsourced. And programming that once mirrored local standards now takes on the coarseness of New York and Los Angeles, where stunningly vulgar sex talk wins big ratings.

If deregulation was supposed to let a thousand flowers bloom, most of the garden appears to be in Clear Channel's yard. The company is regularly accused of limiting playlists, favoring artists who tour through the company's concert wing. (Clear Channel denies any connection between its concert operations and airplay.)

But so what? How many listeners know or care that their favorite pop or rap station is owned by a huge Texas conglomerate? So what if the deejay is talking about Richmond but sitting in Arizona?

"The fact is we're now a healthier industry and you have more choices," says Alfred Liggins III, chief executive of Radio One, the Lanham-based company that started with Washington's black talk station, WOL, and grew into the nation's largest minority-owned radio company. "Is it tougher for the little guy, the mom and pop owner? Yeah.

But that little guy could not provide the same level of talent and service. There aren't 10 Jay Lenos. Why wouldn't you leverage such a talent? Technology allows you to do it, so why wouldn't you?"

But there is a downside to diluting the localism that has given radio its distinctive edge since the dawn of the Top-40 era in the 1950s. Radio for decades played a crucial role in building community -- from deejays visiting high schools to run record hops to news departments that provided essential coverage of storms, riots, elections and scholastic sports.

Consolidation and cutbacks in local staffing have eliminated many of those functions. The prime example wielded against the industry stems from an accident last year in Minot, N.D., where Clear Channel owns all six commercial stations. When a train derailment in the middle of the night released a frightening cloud of anhydrous ammonia, Minot police sought to notify the citizenry of the crisis. They called KCJB, the station designated as the local emergency broadcaster, but no one was home; the station was being run by computer, automatically passing along Clear Channel programming from another city.

Clear Channel argues that only a technical glitch prevented word from getting through. But glitches aside, the six stations now have only one news employee among them.

Even in Washington, where Clear Channel's stations do offer news headlines and WRC relays the audio of CNN Headline News, there is not one reporter gathering news on the street. When the planes struck on 9/11, several of Washington's FM stations had nowhere to turn but to TV; they merely fed the sound from those newscasts.

Maybe it's true that listeners neither notice nor mind. In a Pew Center for the People and the Press survey earlier this year, slightly more Americans said letting companies own more stations would make no difference than said such a move would have a negative impact. But radio executives know that listeners don't pay close attention to the source of what they hear, and that has freed the industry to economize on virtually every detail of programming. Traffic announcers on most big-city stations can often be heard on several stations in the same city, using different names or tones of voice to keep listeners from noticing. For example, Beverly Farmer, who's delivered traffic reports under her own name on several D.C.-area radio stations, has also done stints as "Alex Richards" on WMZQ, "Vera Bruply" on WJFK and "Ginny Bridges" and "Lee McKenzie" on other

stations.

That showbiz stunt is one thing for traffic reports -- what difference does it make who tells you that I-95 is jammed at the Mixing Bowl? -- but it raises tougher questions when it comes to news coverage. Yet the nation's largest traffic reporting company, Metro Networks (owned by a division of Viacom, one of the largest media conglomerates), is trying to win the job of handling news coverage for hundreds of music stations. With rare exceptions such as all-news stations in big cities, radio news has been entirely outsourced, and largely to one company. Even in Washington, it is rare for any radio reporter to show up at news events other than those from all-news WTOP, talk WMAL or occasionally public radio's WAMU.

Washington is a big enough market that its stations still provide hours of locally originated programming. But some popular programs no longer have much local content: WKYS's popular morning man, Russ Parr, used to joke about Hyattsville and comment on the shenanigans of the District government; now that his program is fed to stations around the country, the humor is more generic, the content less local. The same is true of Don and Mike, the bad boys of WJFK's evening drive-time show; Don Geronimo still growls about Fairfax traffic from time to time, but both hosts now spice their show with plenty of references to Philadelphia and other cities where their syndicated program also airs.

Again, listeners don't complain, but the lack of complaint is hardly an endorsement. Radio listenership has been in decline for years. Surely the emotional connection to radio that was a crucial part of the identity of the generation that tucked transistor radios under the pillow and graduated to stereo systems in time for the alternative rock revolution is all but gone. And while local character has declined, the commercial load has crept up to as much as 24 minutes an hour on some stations.

As I work on a book on radio's evolution over the past half-century, I hear almost daily from radio executives who lament what has become of their business and complain about how hard it is to offer creative programming when managers must run four stations at once and deejays are required to be inoffensive and unnoticeable. Even within Clear Channel, station executives privately bemoan what artists now loudly protest, a system in which big radio takes advantage of its market power by requiring record companies to pay for their songs to be on the radio.

In his recent song "The Last DJ," Tom Petty sings,  
". . . there goes your freedom of choice/There goes the  
last human voice/There goes the last DJ."

But the arguments against further consolidating ownership of the media are not simply nostalgia for a time when deejays served as guides to cultural shifts.

There is also a powerful rational objection to a new wave of consolidation, one that fits the FCC's penchant for justifying policy decisions with economic and legal argument: The enormous debt and cost-cutting that follow corporate consolidation has produced a need for safe, bland and cheap programming -- and declining consumer interest. Chain ownership has diminished both the diversity and vibrancy of discussion and debate -- and that is what the FCC is charged to protect on the public's airwaves. As Justice Louis Brandeis once said, "We can have a democratic society or we can have the concentration of great wealth in the hands of the few. We cannot have both."

\*\*\*\*\* end \*\*\*\*\*

<http://login.mail.lycos.com/r/referral?aid=27005>

**From:** L.D.Porter  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 11:11 PM  
**Subject:** Objection

If you don't know that the media is powerful and biased then you have never watched TV. The war for Iraqi Freedom was a great example of media irresponsibility, one-ups-mon-ship and rumor mongering. If they feel they won't be challenged they will become even more brazen. The old Paul Newman film 'Accurate But Not Factual' is an account of exactly what we have, and are, being subjected to by some of the arrogant, superior-minded media. If you have not seen it and are in a position to influence this legislation then you owe it to your constituency to see it.

L. D. Porter

**From:** Olga Campbell  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 18, 2003 11:19 PM  
**Subject:** Don't Allow Fewer Companies to Control Our Broadcast Channels!

Dear Sir,  
We need diversified ownership of our news media!  
Please do not make it easier for fewer companies to control more of the broadcast channels we receive on our TV and radio. How can anyone imagine it would be good to allow just 2 large companies to decide what information we will get?

In our democratic country it is YOUR responsibility to give us access to a diversity of editorial opinions.

Thank you very much for your help in this extremely important issue.

Sincerely,  
Olga E. Campbell  
San Jose, CA

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.  
<http://search.yahoo.com>

**From:** Ryan Willard  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 7:05 AM  
**Subject:** Concealed

Subject: Do not change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules,

Do not change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules,

**From:** Natalie W.  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 8:02 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

Honorable Sir,  
Please do not approve enlarging the power of so few, it is a dangerous move for this Country.  
Robert E. Hofmaster  
St. Michaels, MD

**From:** Jim Hershman  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 8:09 AM  
**Subject:** FCC vote

Dir Sir or Madam:

The FCC will take its final vote on whether or not to change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules," and allow giant media conglomerates to grab an even bigger share of television and radio stations across our nation.

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.
- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.
- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.
- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming.

please do not allow this to happen. You know as well as I do the power of influence that television and broadcasting has to a wide range of people. It has the power to use propaganda to further the cause of making people believe what they want it to.

As an amateur radio operator, I am asking you to please do not vote in favor of this. Please give the chance for all equal people to have just as much a chance to be heard than everybody else and the media will not allow this as they will hide their true agenda in their reporting.

Thank you,

James O. Hershman  
KF4HSR

---

Add photos to your messages with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE\*.  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>



**From:** Randy.Ursino@cityutilities.net  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 8:52 AM  
**Subject:** FCC

Broadcast ownership. Dont even think about it!

**From:** Aaron Mills  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 8:55 AM  
**Subject:** No Censorship

Please Do not change the current Broadcast Ownership Rules.

Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

Thankyou

Aaron Mills  
Prepress Supervisor

[aaronm@dunbarprinting.com](mailto:aaronm@dunbarprinting.com)

**From:** Scott Dangremond  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 9:32 AM  
**Subject:** Vote No

Please vote No to increasing the "broadcast ownership rules".  
Thank you,  
Scott Dangremond

**From:** MIKE CARIKER  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 9:47 AM  
**Subject:** FCC problem

I would like to voice my opposition to the FCC allowing or potentially allowing corporate executives the ability to keep the NRA and similiar groups off our airwaves. I'm not exactly sure what you guys are trying to do, but rest assured, I will do whatever is necessary to prevent this type of abuse of power. Thank you for your time,  
Mike Cariker  
Searcy, Arkansas

---

GO.com Mail  
Get Your Free, Private E-mail at <http://mail.go.com>

**From:** MDoran3208@aol.com  
**To:** charles\_schaifer@fws.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 9:53 AM  
**Subject:** Concern over Radio Station Consolidation

It is with sincere concern over the possible allowance of further consolidation of radio stations by clearly establish conglomerates. Please DO NOT pass pending rules that will allow dominance of the airwaves by a few big players.

Thank you,

Michael Doran

**From:** Mary Blackwell  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner  
Adelstein, senator@warner.senate.gov  
**Date:** Mon, May 19, 2003 10:00 AM  
**Subject:** opposed to 02-277

Please don't do to television what's been done to radio. Media deregulation is bad for America. Keep our media local and free to dissent. Oppose the proposed changes to allow cross-ownership.

Mary Byrd Blackwell

Auction Coordinator

WVPT-PBS, Harrisonburg VA

148-B North Main Street

Woodstock VA 22664